

ting directly upon the individual conscience must be reinforced by legislation. Not long since Editor Moore, of the Gospel Messenger, said in substance, (we are perfectly willing to be corrected by the literal text of his editorial) that if these restrictions imposed by Annual Meeting were removed, "they would plunge headlong into the foolish fashions of the world." Who are "they?" Evidently the people upon whom these restrictions are placed. Now that language shows that the leaders and law makers of the German Baptist brethren regard ecclesiastical legislation as the bulwark of church discipline. But it also shows that at least Elder Moore does not believe that this legislation makes any converts to the "order," for immediately upon its repeal they, one and all, make this terrific "plunge." It remains therefore that he places a moral value upon enforced obedience as differentiated from voluntary obedience. Is he willing to let this imputation rest upon his intelligence? And are his people willing that his imputation of hypocrisy in this matter shall rest upon them? Brother Moore has told us by the most direct implication that you cannot legislate common honesty, even into church people, and brother Miller has read us the same lesson in "barriers burned away" (meaning Annual Meeting authority) by an implication only a little more remote, so that after all see how we agree with these distinguished brethren, for neither do we believe that you can legislate any sort of real religion, piety, or obedience, or plainness, or humility, or faith, or love, or any other virtue into anybody. You can legislate the semblance of these things and thereby put a premium upon hypocrisy.

Realizing this fundamental principle in its relations to church discipline, we have re-established it where it belongs, upon the Word of God alone, and rely solely upon the powerful operation of that Word upon the conscience and heart, when faithfully preached. That Word tells us to "present our bodies, a living sacrifice holy and acceptable unto God which is our reasonable service," and we will let our enemies be judges whether obedience of this injunction "from the heart," or a show of obedience to it from without, would be the more acceptable to the Lord. And if the Word alone is not powerful enough to produce acceptable obedience, is Annual Meeting more powerful that it can, by legislation, do what the Word of God is not able to do? It is true that the church discipline which recognizes the inviolability of voluntary obedience may be powerless to root up many tares but is it the duty of the church to be strict in rooting up the tares? Has not the Lord taught us just the opposite lesson, that we should not be strict in rooting up the tares lest we root up also some of the wheat? And was not the open, flagrant and widespread violation of this law of the Lord direct cause of the division of the Tunker church? Will Miller or Moore answer that question? All protestant churches recognize the validity of excommunication for crimes explicitly set

forth in the Bible, but excepting the Roman Catholics and the German Baptists we do not know of any church which bases discipline upon church traditions, or the rulings of its councils.

Now we come back to the question at the head of this article; "Are these things so?" Are these arguments, statements, principles, true and sound? Should not Brother Miller ask the same question in regard to his charges his statements, his theories and principles of church government? Can any of us afford to be in the wrong? Can we afford to mislead others? Can we afford to sacrifice Gospel truth to sectarian zeal? Ah, there is the snare which has entangled so many good men who to serve their own church can be unjust and uncharitable to others; and even now I do not believe what Brother Miller said against us was prompted so much by his heart as by zeal for the church which has eminently distinguished him with its confidence and patronage.

PULPIT ECHOES.

Ecce Homo

Behold the Man Christ Jesus as God in the flesh; the Redeemer of the world.

As you behold Him, will you, by your own rejection of Him as your Savior, cry out, just as surely as did the rabble of old, crucify Him, crucify Him, we will not have this man to reign over us! The mission of every true minister of the Gospel is to present Jesus Christ the Savior to men and to cry out *Ecce Homo*! The mission of every hearer is to look and live; to receive eternal life thru the Man Christ Jesus. Have you received it?

R. R. TEETER.

The Prayer of Bartimaeus

Many of the events of our Lord's ministry may now be regarded essentially as matters of sacred history—sufficient to feed the devout man's faith. The miracles belong to this class. Others seem to be of perpetual occurrence, and touch the heart and life of God's children. The incident in Luke 18: 35-45 exhibits this class of events.

Theme—Jesus is still passing.

I. How? (1) In our daily experiences—adverse and good. The fatherly discipline of God and the blessed, beautiful things which he sends into our life. (2) Thru his Word—read and preached. He meets all classes of characters with comfort, warning, admonition, promise to whom this precious literature may come. And in every faithful message by the living ministry we can hear His voice and listen to His footsteps.

II. If the statement is true and Jesus is thus passing, what is our duty regarding the event? The answer is found in the prayer of Bartimaeus. As it was with him so it is with us. We need light and life. Jesus has these to give. (1) Bartimaeus called to the proper person. (2) Bartimaeus called at the right time. (3) Bartimaeus called for the right thing. (4) Bartimaeus called with genuine earnestness.

Conclusion. When we pray may we be in earnest. Our prayers should be like the black thunder clouds pressing across the heavens defying the wind that cannot beat it back until it bursts in refreshing showers on the thirsty earth.

J. C. MACKEY.

IMPORTANT QUESTIONS

D. C. MOOMAW.

Under the above caption Elder D. L. Miller publishes in the Gospel Messenger of November 23 some reference to our organization which can not pass without special notice.

The article referred to was suggested by some letters that Elder Miller received from some of their college graduates, asking why more of their educated brethren were not seeking to enter the mission fields of the church. Some suggested that the "form of dress" adopted by the church was a great hindrance to the work, both in the country and in the cities. Now we have no call to help Elder Miller in his labor to get his people to serve the "order," but when he goes out of his way to misrepresent our people so palpably as he has, it becomes our bounden duty to challenge his right to do so, and to point out to the readers of the EVANGELIST those mistakes. I regret that the readers of the Gospel Messenger who read his article can not read my reply. It has been the uniform purpose of many of Elder Miller's brethren to inspire their people with prejudice against us by misrepresentation, as Elder Miller has done.

He says one thing that is true and has special application to Progressives, that "numbers are not always to be taken as an indication of success." If Elder Miller determines our status by that token he would vote us a "success". We have not gained in numbers as fast as was done in Paul's day. I quote now his specific references to our people: "History records one attempt to bring the church to a greater degree of popularity and success and it has been written down as a failure". Who has written the Progressive movement a failure except a few of Elder Miller's brethren who were animated more by their hatred of our work than love of the truth? If Elder Miller will publish some sketches of our prosperous churches we will furnish them to him. Of course we have lost some congregations, and his organization has lost as many in proportion as we have. That is the history of all organizations. But when he writes that the inspiration of the Progressive movement was a desire for popularity, he misrepresents not only our people but thousands of as God-fearing men and women in his own organization as this world ever saw. Does he believe that the intelligent members of his organization who are disloyal to the "order," who now number many thousand, disbelieve in it simply because it makes them unpopular? Is that the kind of Christians that compose so large a part of the Dunkard church?